

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/9222.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Maheshwari Company, c/o H.N.G. and Industries Ltd., Bahadurgarh (Rohtak).

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 112 of 1985

between

SHRI JASBIR SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MAHESHWARI COMPANY
C/O H.N.G. AND INDUSTRIES LTD., BAHADURGARH (ROHTAK)

Present.—

Workman in person.

None for the respondent.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Jasbir Singh and the management of M/s Maheshwari Company, c/o H.N.G. and Industries Ltd., Bahadurgarh (Rohtak), to this Court, for adjudication, — vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 31095-99, dated the 24th July, 1985:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jasbir Singh is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The workman appeared in person. The respondent in spite of service through registered A. D. did not appear. The claim of the workman is that he was employed with the respondent as a Packer for the last 4½ years on monthly wages of Rs. 482 and that the respondent chose to terminate his services unlawfully on 24th January, 1985, in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. The workman is present. He has filed settlement deed Ex. S-1, whereunder he has received sum of Rs. 1500 in full and final settlement of his claim except the amount on account of bonus. So nothing survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

B. P. JINDAL,

Dated the 6th September, 1985.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court, Bahadurgarh.

Endst. No. 112-85/1636, dated the 11th October, 1985

Forwarded† (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court, Bahadurgarh.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/9234.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bahadurgarh Central Co-operative Consumers Store Ltd., Bahadurgarh (Rohtak),

BEFORE SHRI B.P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 101 of '85

between

SHRI UMED SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BAHADURGARH
CENTRAL CO-OPERATIVE CONSUMERS STORE LTD., BAHADURGARH (ROHTAK)

Present.—

None for the petitioner.

Shri Vijay Kumar, Accountant, for the respondent.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the workman Shri Umed Singh and the management of M/s. Bahadurgarh Central Co-operative Consumers Store Ltd., Bahadurgarh (Rohtak), to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 25894—99, dated 17th June, 1985:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Umed Singh is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. Both the parties appeared. The claim of the workman is that he was employed with the respondent as a Labourer since 26th February 1980 but the respondent choose to terminate his services unlawfully on 24th January, 1985 in flagrant disregard of the provisions of 25F and G of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. Before any reply could be filed by the respondent, the petitioner absented. The only inference possible is that the petitioner is not interested in prosecution of this claim. So, this reference is dismissed for non-prosecution and answered accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated the 25th September, 1985.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst. No. 101-85/1649, dated 11th October, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab./9237.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Executive Engineer, H.S.E.B. Sub Urban Division, Fazilpur, Sonapat.

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 208 of 83

between

SHRI PARTAP SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD, SUB URBAN DIVISION, FAZILUR, SONEPAT

Shri R.S. Lakra, A.R., for the workman.

Shri N.P. Singh, A.R., for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the workman and the management of Executive Engineer, Haryana State Electricity Board, Sub Urban Division, Fazilpur, Sonapat to this Court, for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Gazette Notification No. 58397-402, dated 8th November, 1983 :—

Whether termination of services of Shri Partap Singh is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The claim of the workman is that he was employed with the respondent since 22nd June, 1981 as a work charge employee and that his services were terminated by the respondent unlawfully on 31st January, 1983 in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, the claim of the workman has been controverted *in toto*. Please propounded need not be detailed, because this reference is being answered on grounds other than merits.
4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issue was framed by me on 19th December, 1984:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Partap Singh is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

5. Before any evidence could be adduced, the learned Authorised Representative of the respondent Shri N. P. Singh has made a statement in the Court that the workman has since been reinstated with all benefits of previous service but without back wages. On these conditions, reinstatement was accepted by the workman in writing, *vide* his letter, which is undated. So, now, nothing services for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly. There is no order as to cost.

Dated 19th September, 1985.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court, Sonapat

Endst. No. 208-83/1652, dated 11th October, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak,
Camp Court, Sonapat.

The 25th November, 1985*

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/9451.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Mahavir Woollen Mills, Industrial Area, Panipat.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, AMBALA

Ref. No. 94 of 1985

SHRI BHOORE LAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS MAHAVIR
WOOLLEN MILLS, INDUSTRIAL AREA, PANIPAT

Present :—

None for workman.

Shri S. Kaushal for respondent.

AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana, in the exercise of powers conferred, *vide* clause (c) of sub-section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute between Shri Bhoore Lal, workman and the management of Messrs Mahavir Woollen Mills, Panipat. The terms of the reference are as under :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Bhoori Lal, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled to?

Shri Bhoore Lal alleged that he was in the employment of respondent on 2nd January, 1984. He met with an accident, his thumb was chopped off. He got treatment from ESI dispensary where he was treated upon. On 22nd February, 1984 when he approached the management with a fitness certificate but management refused to take him in its employment. Respondent-management was served for 17th August, 1985, but workman should not be served, so this reference was posted for service of.

workman for 28th September, 1985. The cases of 28th September, 1985 were posted for 30th September, 1985 because Saturday was declared an holiday. Workman refused service of Registered Letter for this date. Accordingly, the reference is dismissed in default.

Dated the 30th September, 1985.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endorsement No. 2456, dated the 10th October, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/5/84-Lab/9452.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. English Electric Company :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
AMBALA

Reference No. 154 of 1985

SHRI VIRENDER SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS ENGLISH
ELECTRIC COMPANY

Present :—

Shri Karan Singh for workman.

Shri S. S. Sirohi for respondent.

AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in exercise of powers conferred,—vide clause (c) of sub-section (10) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad between Shri Virender Singh, workman, and the management of M/s. English Electric Company. The terms of the reference are as under :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Virender Singh, was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled to ?”

On constitution of Labour Court at Ambala, this reference was received by transfer.

Shri Virender Singh alleged that he had been in the service of respondent since 1st June, 1983. His services were terminated illegally on 29th January, 1985 in utter violation of section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. He has prayed for his reinstatement with continuity in service and with full back wages. Respondent was served. Shri S. S. Sirohi appeared for management. Parties made statement that they have compromised the dispute. Accordingly the reference is disposed of as compromised.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.

Dated the 30th September, 1985.

Endst. No 2457, dated the 10th October, 1985.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Ambala.